

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 26 March 2026 17:27:49 UTC+01:00
To: "Planning" <planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/26/0366
Categories: Comments Received

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 26/03/2026 4:27 PM.

Application Summary

Address: Land North West of Southwater

Proposal: Outline planning application, with all matters reserved (except for primary access to the high-way) for a phased development comprising: the demolition of existing buildings and the construction of up to 1,000 residential dwellings (including affordable housing) (Use Class C3); up to 80 specialist accommodation units (Use Class C2); a mixed-use neighbourhood centre (Use Classes E and F); education facilities (Use Class F1(a)); business and employment floorspace (Use Classes B2, B8 and E(g)); redevelopment of existing agricultural buildings including construction of a building for community use (Use Classes E and F2); improvements to public rights of way; sports pitches; gypsy and traveller pitches/plots; public open space; landscaping, and associated infrastructure

Case Officer: Matthew Porter

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address: 83 Bluecoat Pond Christs Hospital Horsham

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

- Highway Access and Parking
- Loss of General Amenity
- Overdevelopment
- Privacy Light and Noise
- Trees and Landscaping

Comments:

There are two parts to my objection, the first part concerns the main development on land north-west of Southwater and the second part concerns development of the field known as 'The Warren' adjacent to Christ's Hospital station on which a new car park is proposed.

Objections to main development - land north-west of Southwater

1 It is contrary to the Southwater plan which was agreed and put in place following extensive consultation with local people. It more than doubles the size of what the plan allows and creates an additional village centre which the plan prohibits. To accept this planning application would make a mockery of local democratic processes.

2 The issue of water scarcity and management of waste water is a concern not resolved through plans. Although the planning restriction around water neutrality has been lifted, it doesn't negate there being a very real issue of insufficient supply from the Arun. Additionally, sewage regularly flows into our rivers and fields, additional pressures won't improve that situation.

3 It would result in the loss of some beautiful and irreplaceable countryside, magnificent trees and associated wildlife and their habitat. There has been extensive development and associated destruction of wildlife habitats locally already.

4 There would be loss of amenity to local residents. The area is currently used extensively by local residents with huge benefit to their health and well-being. The character of the village will be dramatically changed and the current community feel will be damaged by doubling the size of the village.

5 The Transport network won't cope with the additional traffic generation and there will be an impact on highway safety. In some places it will be physically impossible to adjust the road infrastructure to cope with the inevitable additional traffic. Roads surrounding the proposed site are already dangerous, and in places so narrow that it's difficult for two cars to pass comfortably side by side, for example on Tower Hill.

6 There will be more flooding as the proposed area is heavy clay and the standard drainage suggested won't work here. Each winter there is regular flooding on Two Mile Ash Road, making the road impassable, damaging the road surface and forcing traffic elsewhere. Additional building will make the flooding much worse and increased traffic resulting from the expansion will compound

these issues and further reduce road safety.

7 Safety for children - Two Mile Ash Road / Tower Hill is the councils recommended walking route for children from Christ's Hospital to access Tanbridge school, increased traffic on that already dangerous stretch of road with no pavement will increase the risk to those using that walking route.

8 The local health and social care infrastructure won't cope with the additional residents - Local services for health and social care and generally considered to be beyond capacity. There appear to be no plans to supplement or support such services for additional residents. These should be in place first before expanding the local community.

9 There are no concrete plans for building and running new schools for the area. Current local schools are at capacity with some local children being sent to schools further away. Adequate local schooling should be in place first before expanding the local community. There is already a precedent for land that had been reserved for schooling not actually being used for that purpose at the development in Broadridge Heath.

Objections to development of 'The Warren' - land next to Christ's Hospital station into an additional station car park

1 There is no business case

The proposal involves turning a beautiful local field and resource into a car park, however a survey completed over the summer by local residents shows that there is no business case for this.

For a 6-week period between 10th November 2025 and 21st December 2025, local residents counted the number of cars in the existing station car parks every day during peak times. Over this period the mean average occupancy across the week was 35% with peak days of the week averaging 51.7% occupancy with a maximum recorded being just over 70%. I understand this data has been provided to you.

The under-utilised car parks currently serve residents from all the local villages with commuters coming from Rudgwick, Slinfold, Broadbridge Heath, Southwater etc. Given the large local community the railway station serves, it is difficult to see how it would be necessary to double the parking available based on the number of additional new homes - the figures just don't stack up.

2 There is poor access

The road currently serving the station is single track and there is no scope to widen it as the green to the west is privately owned

and not for sale. The recent residential development and associated poor drainage has resulted in the road flooding regularly during the winter, damaging the road surface and making access difficult. An additional car park of the scale proposed would likely exacerbate the situation. The development flood assessment does not cover this part of the proposed development.

3 There would be loss of beautiful and irreplaceable countryside.

The field is full of magnificent trees some with and some without TPOs, along with associated wildlife and their habitat. Locally we have deer, bats, hedgehogs, dormice and other small mammals that have been regularly sighted in that field.

4 There would be loss of amenity to local residents

The proposed development site is a field much loved by local residents. We use it extensively for walks and for children to play in with huge benefit to our health and well-being.

5 There would be increased noise, pollution, disturbance, nuisance, and crime for local residents

Cars using the car parks will create additional noise and disturbance for residents, many of whom have homes close to the boundary. There will be increased pollution from the proposed lighting arrangements and reduction in air quality as a result of increased traffic.

There is scope for the car park attracting antisocial behaviour at night, disturbing residents, and compromising their safety. We are already aware that the current station car parks are often used for anti-social behaviour so it's reasonable to assume that a new car park would exacerbate the problem resulting in an increase in crime in the immediate area.

6 There would be loss of privacy for local residents

Many local residents have houses sited close to the boundary and so would lose their current privacy and be over-looked by the proposed new car park.

In conclusion, I strongly object to the whole development but most particularly to that proposed in 'The Warren' adjacent to Christ's Hospital station where there are no benefits and extensive disadvantages for the local community, environment, and wildlife.

Kind regards

Telephone:

Email: planning@horsham.gov.uk



**Horsham
District
Council**

Horsham District Council, Alberty House, Springfield Road, Horsham, West Sussex RH12 2GB
Telephone: 01403 215100 (calls may be recorded) www.horsham.gov.uk Chief Executive: Jane Eaton